UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

MN

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/790,656	03/01/2004	Chirag D. Dalal	VRT0126US	9561

60429   7590   05/07/2007

CSA LLP
4807 SPICEWOOD SPRINGS RD.
BLDG. 4, SUITE 201
AUSTIN, TX 78759

EXAMINER
LI, ZHUO H

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2185	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
05/07/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *3* MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *06 February 2007*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-21* is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-21* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3)☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .

5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application

6)☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Remarks

1.   This Office action is in response to the remarks filed 2/22/2007.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

2.   The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the

basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed
> in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for
> patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an
> international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this
> subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United
> States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

3.   Claims 1-5, 8-16 and 19-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by

Russell (US PAT. 6,826,600).

Regarding claim 1, Russell discloses a method comprising a computer system (100,

figure 1) creating a first storage object (150, figure 1), wherein the first storage object is created

to have a property (col. 10 lines 58-61 and col. 14 lines 13-18, i.e., a client computer system

operating software to generate local object definitions and object property 152 being a local

object identification that identifies the local object definitions), the computer system creating a

second storage object out of the first storage object, wherein the second storage object depends

on the property of the first storage object (col. 11 lines 2-10 and col. 14 lines 29-54, i.e., a sever

creating a global object specification corresponding local object definitions), and the computer

system modifying the first storage object, wherein the modified first storage object maintains the

property upon which the second storage object depends (col. 11 lines 10-24, col. 14 lines 55-62

and col. 15 lines 16-22, i.e., providing new global object specification object definitions to the

client and replacing the local object specification with the new global object specification).

Regarding claim 2, Russell discloses the computer system creating a third storage object,

wherein the third storage object is created to have a property (col. 19 lines 28-56, i.e., creating a

new object specification once a collaboration session is underway), wherein the computer system

creates the second storage object out of the first and third storage object, wherein the second

storage object depends on the properties of the first and third objects (col. 20 lines 1-62, i.e.,

server 130 creating a new object definitions, read as third storage object, within the global object

identification, read as second storage object based on the command or other instruction from

client such that the new object definition includes a new unique global object definition and any

object properties specified in the object operation are also included as object properties).

Regarding claim 3, Russell teaches the steps of creating the first storage object

comprising creating a first description of the first object and transmitting all or a portion of the

first description to a first computing system (col. 10 line 58 through col. 11 line 2), and creating

the second storage object comprising creating a second description of the first storage object and

transmitting all or a portion of the second description to a second computer system (col. 11 lines

2-12).

Regarding claim 4, Russell teaches the step of modifying the first storage object

comprising creating a modified first description of the modified first storage object and

transmitting the modified first description to the first computer system (col. 11 lines 13-24).

Regarding claim 5, Russell teaches the second description comprising a configuration map that maps a local memory block of the second storage object to a logical memory block of the first storage object (col. 18 lines 1-11).

Regarding claim 8, Russell discloses a method comprising a computer system (100, figure 1) creating a first storage object (150, figure 1), wherein the first storage object is created to have a individual or collective properties (col. 10 lines 58-61 and col. 14 lines 13-18, i.e., a client computer system operating software to generate local object definitions and object property 152 being a local object identification that identifies the local object definitions), the computer system creating a second storage object out of the first storage object, wherein the second storage object depends on the individual or collective properties of the first storage object (col. 11 lines 2-10 and col. 14 lines 29-54, i.e., a sever creating a global object specification corresponding local object definitions), and the computer system receiving information that the property of a storage object of the one or more first storage objects has changed and that the second object can no longer depend on the individual or collective properties of the one or more first storage object (col. 11 lines 10-24, col. 18 lines 12-16, i.e., determining that the local in global object specifications do not contain corresponding object definitions), the computer system responding after receiving the information (col. 18 lines 16-21, i.e., providing an indication that it did not map the local object specification to the global object specification).

Regarding claim 9, Russell discloses the computer responding comprising generating a message indicating that warning that the second storage object con no longer depend on the individual or collective properties of the one or more storage object (col. 18 lines 16-21).

Regarding claims 10-11, Russell discloses the computer responding comprising replacing the storage object with a new storage object, which modifies the storage object (col. 18 lines 22-39).

Regarding claim 12, the limitations of the claim are rejected as the same reasons as set forth in claim 1.

Regarding claim 13, the limitations of the claim are rejected as the same reasons as set forth in claim 2.

Regarding claim 14, the limitations of the claim are rejected as the same reasons as set forth in claim 3.

Regarding claim 15, the limitations of the claim are rejected as the same reasons as set forth in claim 4.

Regarding claim 16, the limitations of the claim are rejected as the same reasons as set forth in claim 5.

Regarding claims 19-21, the limitations of the claims are rejected as the same reasons as set forth in claim 1.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

5.   Claims 6-7 and 17-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Russell (US PAT. 6,826,600) in view of Furuhashi et al. (US 2003/0229698 hereinafter

Furuhashi).

Regarding claims 6-7, Russell differs from the claimed invention in not specifically

teaching creating the first storage object comprising allocating a logical unit or a physical storage

device of a data storage subsystem to the first storage object, wherein the first description

comprises a configuration map that maps a logical memory block of the first storage object to a

logical memory block of the logical unit or to a physical memory block of the physical storage

device. However, Furuhashi teaches information processing system having data storage area

allocating unit (224, figure 1), read as a logical unit, for mapping a logical memory block of a

first storage object to a logical memory block of the logical unit ([0045], i.e., allocating unit

specifies a position of a storage area to which the data is stored in respond of read kind or

utilization purpose on the bases of characteristic information of the memory device) in order to

improve the access performance to data and its reliability in a technique of allocating data to a

plurality of storage areas of a storage. Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of

ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Russell in creating the first

storage object comprising allocating a logical unit or a physical storage device of a data storage

subsystem to the first storage object, wherein the first description comprises a configuration map

that maps a logical memory block of the first storage object to a logical memory block of the

logical unit or to a physical memory block of the physical storage device, as per teaching of

Furuhashi, in order to improve the access performance to data and its reliability in the technique

of allocating the data to the plurality of storage areas of the storage.

Regarding claims 17-18, the limitations of the claims are rejected as the same reasons as

set forth in claims 6-7.

Response to Arguments

6.   Applicant's arguments filed 2/22/2007 have been fully considered but they are not

persuasive.

In response to applicant's argument that the references fail to show certain features of

applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., the computer

system modifying the first storage object, wherein the modified first storage object maintains the

property upon which the second storage object depends) are clearly recited in Russell. It is noted

that Russell teaches to create a global object specification (read as second storage object) based

on a local object specification (read as a first storage object) created by a client (col. 11 lines 2-6)

and then to return the global object specification to the client such that the client replaces the

local object specification with the global object specification (col. 11 lines 10-24, read as

modifying the first storage object). Note Russell teaches the modification or replacement of the

local object specification (i.e., the first storage object) with the global object specification (i.e.,

the second object) such the new replaced local object specification maintains the property upon

which the global storage object depends because the client is requested to compare the global

object specification to the local object specification to determine whether the server properly

created the global object specification based on the local object specification (col. 11 lines 10-

24). In addition, the claimed language fails to clearly define how the modified first storage object

maintains the property upon which the second storage object depends. Thus, Russell teaches the unduly broad claimed limitations as recited in claim 1.

In response to applicant's argument that the references fail to show certain features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., the computer system receiving information that the property of a storage object of the one or more first storage objects has changed and that the second storage object can no longer depend on the individual or collective properties of the one or more first storage object) are clearly recited in Russell. It is noted that Russell teaches the modification or replacement of the local object specification (i.e., the first storage object) with the global object specification (i.e., the second object) such the new replaced local object specification maintains the property upon which the global storage object depend because the client is requested to compare the global object specification to the local object specification to determine whether the server properly created the global object specification based on the local object specification (col. 11 lines 10-24), wherein the global object specification can no longer depend upon local object identification when they are not properly map with each other(col. 18 lines 12-21). Note the claimed language fails to clearly define how the second storage object can no longer depend on the individual or collective properties of the one or more first storage objects. Thus, Russell teaches the unduly broad claimed limitations as recited in claim 8.

For at least these reasons, Examiner maintained the rejection of claims 12, 19, 20 and 21. Claims 2-5, 9-11 and 13-16 are, respectively, dependent upon rejected independent claims 1, 8 and 12 such that they are still being rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102 by Russell. In addition, claims

6-7 and 17-18 are stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) because they are dependent upon

rejected claims 1 and 12, respectively.

Conclusion

7.   **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time

policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE

MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO

MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after

the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period

will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37

CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event,

however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing

date of this final action.

8.   Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Zhuo H. Li whose telephone number is 571-272-4183. The

examiner can normally be reached on Tues - Fri 9:00am - 6:30pm and alternate Monday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Sanjiv Shah, can be reached on 571-272-4098. The fax phone number for the

organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

9.   Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent

Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications

may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished

applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR

system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR

system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Zhuo H. Li

Patent Examiner

April 14, 2007

SANJIV SHAH
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100